

THE STATE CAPITAL

An Unexpected Movement as to the Police Justices Bill.

EMASCULATION OF THE REMOVAL BILL.

Defeat of the Repealing Clauses of the Sunday Procession Bill.

ALBANY, April 16, 1875.
The Senate and Assembly have taken their usual weekly recess, and most of our legislators left for home this afternoon. An immense amount of work has been done during the past week in routine business on bills already introduced. Both houses sit from ten until two o'clock daily, and for nearly three hours almost every night.

LIGHTNING REGULATION.

Some few days since Senator Fox introduced his bill providing for the appointment of two police justices by the Mayor to hold special sessions. A third was to be selected from their number by the present Board of Police Justices. A decided need for an increase of those officials seems to exist. It is stated that the gentlemen at present on the Bench are greatly over-worked and evils result in consequence. Formerly they could be assisted by Aldermen or civil justices, but now the law prevents such action. It has been alleged that the bill was introduced by Senator Fox to give places to friends, but that is certainly no argument against its passage. If a proper administration of justice in the minor courts of New York city requires the passage of this law I see no reason why political considerations should step in to defeat it. Similar frivolous objections have been raised in opposition to Mr. Waenner's bill providing for the organization of a city criminal court. Both bills should pass, and I trust the good sense of the Legislature will prevail as to the merits of the bills without resort to partisan considerations.

SENATOR FOX'S BILL IN THE SENATE.

On Thursday night Senator Fox's bill was reported favorably, went through Committee of the Whole, read a third time and passed. This work was accomplished in about half an hour. Twenty Senators were present, democrats and republicans. They all voted unanimously in favor of the bill. Such afeat of legislative rapid transit has scarcely ever been surpassed. Senator Fox naturally felt elated. His personal popularity in the Senate no doubt carried this pet measure to a successful issue. The bill was then sent to the Assembly for concurrence, and there referred to the Committee on Cities.

The morning of T. J. Campbell moved to discharge the committee from consideration of the bill and desired it be ordered to a third reading. This was an adroit movement to pass the bill at once and send it before the Governor for signature. The motion, unfortunately for Mr. Campbell, required unanimous consent, and Mr. Colle, of Kings, objected. A few minutes later a respectful message came from the Senate asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Cities. Senator Wadsworth, Chairman of the Committee on Cities, who was not present when the bill passed, offered a resolution asking for the return of the bill. The gentleman probably concluded that the bill was not in favor of the public welfare, and in position was all their tricks are looked upon as laudable victories. Some parliamentary skirmishing resulted in the Assembly before the bill went back. Unanimous consent, however, was given, and the bill was then sent to the Senate.

It is understood that all misunderstandings will now be smoothed over, and, after some slight alterations, the measure again sent down to the Assembly.

SUNDAY PROCESSION LAW KILLED.

At the early part of the session, Mr. Bradley, of Kings, introduced a bill providing for the repeal of the law which prohibited processions in the public streets upon Sundays. At the time of introducing the bill he said it was in favor of the Governor to be in favor of the passage. But it must be recognized, the "responsible majority" scarcely knew their own minds for twenty-four hours at a time. They were bewitched by republican arguments, and in the end were all in favor of the bill. In the following members did not vote—Messrs. Arvold, Gallagher, Gelney, Faze, Farnon, Schenck, Stacy, Tewksbury, Tremain, Wagner, and Williams. The bill was then sent to the Assembly for concurrence, and there referred to the Committee on Cities.

THE CANAL FRAUDS.

The bill to regulate remedies for erroneous assessments in the city of Brooklyn was passed. The Senate adjourned until Monday evening.

On motion of Mr. Wooster the bill passed in the Senate last night relative to justice' courts was recalled from the Assembly.

ASSEMBLY.

ALBANY, April 16, 1875.
BILLS PASSED.

Amending the act regulating processions and parades in cities. Lost.

Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL moved a reconsideration, and that the motion lie on the table. Lost, and the bill killed.

To concur in all the charters of savings banks to a uniformity of provision.

THE SPECIAL SESSIONS BILL.

A resolution was received from the Senate requesting the return of the bill, and relative to the Court of Appeals, and the New York City Tax.

Mr. WAENNER raised a point of order, that this bill, having been referred to a committee, the bill could not be voted on.

Mr. ALVON said the point of order was not well taken, but in order to obviate any trouble, he moved that the committee be instructed to report a bill in consideration of the bill and that it be returned to the Senate.

Mr. WAENNER raised the point, that the motion could not be made, as the bill had been referred uppon.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure. The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would be better to change it, as it was not a good bill.

Mr. ALVON moved a point of order that the bill, being a bill of a committee, is in the custody of the House, which could order its return.

Mr. ALVON could see no reason why the bill should not be voted on.

Mr. WAENNER said this was a political measure.

The Senate had passed it, and now it saw fit to reconsider it, so as to allow the bill to appear with contempt. He spoke against the provisions of the bill in this respect, which deprived man of the right of counsel.

Mr. T. C. CAMPBELL defended the provision, saying it would